

## REMARKS

Applicants acknowledge receipt of the Office Action dated June 30, 2008. In that action, the Examiner: (1) allowed claims 1-45; and (2) rejected claims 46 and 47 under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by pre-grant publication No. US 2002/0062956 to Murray et al. (“Murray”). Allowance of claims 1-45 is appreciated, and reconsideration of the rejected claims is respectfully requested.

### *Status of the Claims*

Claims 1-72 are currently pending, with claims 48-72 being withdrawn from consideration.

Claims 1-45 are allowed.

Claims 46 and 47 are rejected.

Claims 42-47 are amended for clerical reasons.

### *Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §102(a)*

Claims 46 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by pre-grant publication No. US 2002/0062956 to Murray. Murray must disclose each and every element of claim 46 and 47 to properly anticipate the claims.

Claim 46 includes providing a supply of lubricant on the expansion device within the trailing edge portion. Claim 47 includes a means for providing a supply of a solid lubricant on the expansion device within the trailing edge portion. To further illuminate these features, Applicants reference the exemplary embodiments at paragraphs [0096] – [0098] and Figure 12. Lubricant is supplied at the trailing edge portion 96 (see Figure 12) because “the radial clearance between the expansion cone and the tubular member in the trailing edge portion during the radial expansion process is typically extremely small, and the operating contact pressures between the tubular member and the self-lubricating expansion mandrel are extremely high, [thus reducing] the quantity of lubricating fluid provided to the trailing edge portion....[T]his reduction in lubrication in the trailing edge portion increases the forces required to radially expand the tubular member.”

By contrast, Murray does not teach any structure or process for providing lubrication to the trailing edge portion. While grooves 21 do provide lubrication to the leading frustoconical surface

18 in Figure 1A of Murray, there is nothing to provide lubrication to the trailing surface axially opposite surface 18. As noted above, the trailing edge portion must be provided with a lubricant to reduce expansion forces. Further, while the leading contact area of the swage 44 is provided with grooves 21a in Figure 4, there is no teaching that lubrication is provided to the trailing surface oppositely angled from the leading contact surface. Figures 1-4 of Murray show fluid ports 38, 138 extending to the trailing surface of the swage 44 (see Murray at [0022], [0023] and [0031]); however these ports are simply well fluid bypass ports and not trailing edge lubrication ports coupled to a supply of lubricant.

For at least these reasons, Murray does not disclose providing a supply of lubricant within the trailing edge portion of the expansion device and thus cannot anticipate claims 46 and 47.

### CONCLUSION

In the course of the foregoing discussions, Applicants may have at times referred to claim limitations in shorthand fashion, or may have focused on a particular claim element. This discussion should not be interpreted to mean that the other limitations can be ignored or dismissed. The claims must be viewed as a whole, and each limitation of the claims must be considered when determining the patentability of the claims. Moreover, it should be understood that there may be other distinctions between the claims and the cited art which have yet to be raised, but which may be raised in the future.

If any fees are inadvertently omitted or if any additional fees are required or have been overpaid, please appropriately charge or credit those fees to USPTO Deposit Account Number 03-2769 (2724-12105).

Respectfully submitted,

/Matt Moscicki/  
Matthew R. Moscicki  
Reg. No. 57,524  
CONLEY ROSE, P.C.  
P. O. Box 3267  
Houston, Texas 77253-3267  
(713) 228-4097 (Phone)  
(713) 238-8008 (Facsimile)  
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANTS